UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/601,828	06/23/2003	Guo Rui Deng	216683-114025	9067
44200 7590 06/28/2010 HONIGMAN MILLER SCHWARTZ & COHN LLP			EXAMINER	
38500 WOODWARD AVENUE SUITE 100 BLOOMFIELD HILLS, MI 48304-5048			DEXTER, CLARK F	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			3724	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/28/2010	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Examiner Art Unit Clark F. Dexter 3724	Into minus Cumana ma	10/601,828	1,828 DENG ET AL.	
All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel): (1) Mr. Dan Henry. (3) Mr. Clark Dexter. (4)	Interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
(1) Mr. Dan Henry. (2) Mr. Tim Bogel. (4) Date of Interview: 24 June 2010. Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal (copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3.863.550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka, Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clarify how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to sel forth that metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be faught to rsuggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, if appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, as unmmary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERCIPO OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS PROM THIS IN		Clark F. Dexter	3724	
Date of Interview: 24 June 2010. Type: a) ☐ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference c ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☐ No. If Yes, brief description: ☐ Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about fluricional language and a discussion was held to further clairly how the present fluricional language is being interpreted by the Examiner-Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent dess not appear to be teught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reve	All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO	personnel):		
Date of Interview: 24 June 2010. Type: a) □ Telephonic b) □ Video Conference c) □ Personal [copy given to: 1) □ applicant 2) □ applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) □ Yes e) □ No. If Yes, brief description: □ . Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3.863.550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) □ was reached. g) □ was not reached. h) □ N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inaquage is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS NTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Intervi	(1) <u>Mr. Dan Henry</u> .	(3)Mr. Clark Dexter.		
Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative] Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Pes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3.863.550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be laught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the application for such as allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if a	(2) <u>Mr. Tim Bogel</u> .	(4)		
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No. If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clarify how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Date of Interview: <u>24 June 2010</u> .			
If Yes, brief description: Claim(s) discussed: 1. Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) NA. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clairly how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE NTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filled, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THE INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.		2)∏ applicant's representative	e]	
Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3,863,550. Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clarify how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	· —	e)⊠ No.		
Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A. Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clarify how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Claim(s) discussed: <u>1</u> .			
Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clarify how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Identification of prior art discussed: Sarka et al., pn 3,863,5	5 <u>50</u> .		
reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss the outstanding Office action, particularly language to clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, particularly Sarka. Applicant inquired about functional language and a discussion was held to further clarify how the present functional language is being interpreted by the Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed including language to set forth that the metal base portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examiner's position is that such a permanent attachment does not appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so long as there is support in the present application for such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such structure would distinguish over the applied prior art. (A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.) THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.	Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g)⊠ was not reached. h)□ N	I/A.	
	reached, or any other comments: Applicant called to discuss clearly distinguish the claimed invention over the prior art, a language and a discussion was held to further clarify how to Examiner. Further, proposed claim language was discussed portion is permanently attached to the covering. The Examinot appear to be taught or suggested by the prior art and so such a structure, it appears that a limitation claiming such a such a structure, if necessary, and a copy of the amendallowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no callowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached. THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ANTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW ASTATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.	es the outstanding Office action carticularly Sarka. Applicant in the present functional language of including language to set for iner's position is that such a proportion of the structure would distinguish over ments which the examiner agopy of the amendments that will.) CTION MUST INCLUDE THE last Office action has already OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY ERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, RVIEW. See Summary of Ref	n, particularly lar required about function is being interpretent that the metal ermanent attachment application in the applied prior the applied prior the applied prior the substance of the su	nguage to nctional reted by the I base ment does ation for or art. er the claims claims DF THE LICANT IS THIS LATER, TO

Application No.

Applicant(s)

Summary of Record of Interview Requirements

Manual of Patent Examining Procedure (MPEP), Section 713.04, Substance of Interview Must be Made of Record

A complete written statement as to the substance of any face-to-face, video conference, or telephone interview with regard to an application must be made of record in the application whether or not an agreement with the examiner was reached at the interview.

Title 37 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) § 1.133 Interviews Paragraph (b)

In every instance where reconsideration is requested in view of an interview with an examiner, a complete written statement of the reasons presented at the interview as warranting favorable action must be filed by the applicant. An interview does not remove the necessity for reply to Office action as specified in §§ 1.111, 1.135. (35 U.S.C. 132)

37 CFR §1.2 Business to be transacted in writing.

All business with the Patent or Trademark Office should be transacted in writing. The personal attendance of applicants or their attorneys or agents at the Patent and Trademark Office is unnecessary. The action of the Patent and Trademark Office will be based exclusively on the written record in the Office. No attention will be paid to any alleged oral promise, stipulation, or understanding in relation to which there is disagreement or doubt.

The action of the Patent and Trademark Office cannot be based exclusively on the written record in the Office if that record is itself incomplete through the failure to record the substance of interviews.

It is the responsibility of the applicant or the attorney or agent to make the substance of an interview of record in the application file, unless the examiner indicates he or she will do so. It is the examiner's responsibility to see that such a record is made and to correct material inaccuracies which bear directly on the question of patentability.

Examiners must complete an Interview Summary Form for each interview held where a matter of substance has been discussed during the interview by checking the appropriate boxes and filling in the blanks. Discussions regarding only procedural matters, directed solely to restriction requirements for which interview recordation is otherwise provided for in Section 812.01 of the Manual of Patent Examining Procedure, or pointing out typographical errors or unreadable script in Office actions or the like, are excluded from the interview recordation procedures below. Where the substance of an interview is completely recorded in an Examiners Amendment, no separate Interview Summary Record is required.

The Interview Summary Form shall be given an appropriate Paper No., placed in the right hand portion of the file, and listed on the "Contents" section of the file wrapper. In a personal interview, a duplicate of the Form is given to the applicant (or attorney or agent) at the conclusion of the interview. In the case of a telephone or video-conference interview, the copy is mailed to the applicant's correspondence address either with or prior to the next official communication. If additional correspondence from the examiner is not likely before an allowance or if other circumstances dictate, the Form should be mailed promptly after the interview rather than with the next official communication.

The Form provides for recordation of the following information:

- Application Number (Series Code and Serial Number)
- Name of applicant
- Name of examiner
- Date of interview
- Type of interview (telephonic, video-conference, or personal)
- Name of participant(s) (applicant, attorney or agent, examiner, other PTO personnel, etc.)
- An indication whether or not an exhibit was shown or a demonstration conducted
- An identification of the specific prior art discussed
- An indication whether an agreement was reached and if so, a description of the general nature of the agreement (may be by attachment of a copy of amendments or claims agreed as being allowable). Note: Agreement as to allowability is tentative and does not restrict further action by the examiner to the contrary.
- The signature of the examiner who conducted the interview (if Form is not an attachment to a signed Office action)

It is desirable that the examiner orally remind the applicant of his or her obligation to record the substance of the interview of each case. It should be noted, however, that the Interview Summary Form will not normally be considered a complete and proper recordation of the interview unless it includes, or is supplemented by the applicant or the examiner to include, all of the applicable items required below concerning the substance of the interview.

A complete and proper recordation of the substance of any interview should include at least the following applicable items:

- 1) A brief description of the nature of any exhibit shown or any demonstration conducted,
- 2) an identification of the claims discussed,
- 3) an identification of the specific prior art discussed,
- 4) an identification of the principal proposed amendments of a substantive nature discussed, unless these are already described on the Interview Summary Form completed by the Examiner.
- 5) a brief identification of the general thrust of the principal arguments presented to the examiner,
 - (The identification of arguments need not be lengthy or elaborate. A verbatim or highly detailed description of the arguments is not required. The identification of the arguments is sufficient if the general nature or thrust of the principal arguments made to the examiner can be understood in the context of the application file. Of course, the applicant may desire to emphasize and fully describe those arguments which he or she feels were or might be persuasive to the examiner.)
- 6) a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed, and
- 7) if appropriate, the general results or outcome of the interview unless already described in the Interview Summary Form completed by the examiner.

Examiners are expected to carefully review the applicant's record of the substance of an interview. If the record is not complete and accurate, the examiner will give the applicant an extendable one month time period to correct the record.

Examiner to Check for Accuracy

If the claims are allowable for other reasons of record, the examiner should send a letter setting forth the examiner's version of the statement attributed to him or her. If the record is complete and accurate, the examiner should place the indication, "Interview Record OK" on the paper recording the substance of the interview along with the date and the examiner's initials.